

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4-12, 15-23, and 26-33 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 1-33 stand rejected on prior art grounds. Claims 11, 22, and 33 stand objected to upon informalities. Claims 2, 13, 24 are rejected upon formalities. The Office Action indicates that claims 2, 13, and 24 contain allowable subject matter, which upon curing the informalities identified in the rejection of claims 2, 13, and 24, and incorporating claims 2, 13, and 24 into their respective intervening base claims, would render the claimed subject matter allowed. Accordingly, claims 1, 11, 12, 22, 23, and 33 are amended herein to include the subject matter of claims 2, 13, and 24, which are now cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Additionally, claims 3, 14, and 25 are also cancelled herein without prejudice or disclaimer. This amendment is being made, in part, based on a telephonic interview between the Examiner and the undersigned attorney on May 22, 2007 in which the claimed amendments were discussed and agreed to as overcoming the current rejections. Moreover, the Examiner indicated that the amended claims as submitted herewith would be allowed. Therefore, claims 1, 4-12, 15-23, and 26-33 are in condition for immediate allowance. Applicants respectfully traverse these objections/rejections based on the following discussion.

I. The Objections to the Claims

Claims 11, 22, and 33 are objected to for containing insufficient antecedent basis for the claimed language. Applicants herein amend claims 11, 22, and 33 in the manner suggested in the Office Action to provide proper antecedent basis for all of the claimed language. In view of the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the objection.

II. The 35 U.S.C. §112 Rejections

Claims 2, 13, and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph for containing insufficient antecedent basis for the claimed language and for containing, according to the Office Action, unclear language. Accordingly, claims 2, 13, and 24 are cancelled herein without prejudice or disclaimer. In view of the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection.

III. The Prior Art Rejections

Claims 11, 22, and 33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Smyth et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,028,261) hereinafter referred to as “Smyth” in view of Huang et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0133569), hereinafter referred to as “Huang”. Claims 1-10, 12, 21, and 23-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Smyth in view of Huang, in further view of O’Brien et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,055,569), hereinafter referred to as “O’Brien”. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections based on the following discussion.

Smyth teaches an internet website which presents a hierarchical menu structure to users includes a personalization engine to automatically modify the menu structure for each user at least according to that user’s previous browsing history at the site. In one embodiment the engine provides, as menu options for a selected menu page of the hierarchical menu, a plurality of the most probable links which the user may wish to reach from the selected menu page. In another embodiment there are provided, as additional menu options for a particular menu page, a plurality of links which are similar, as determined by meeting a predetermined similarity metric, to menu options present on the particular menu page other than through meeting the similarity metric.

Huang teaches a computer-implemented method and system for processing transactions between a client device and a web page. The system includes an adapter for receiving and interpreting a request from the client device, wherein the adapter is configured to interface with the client device. A generator retrieves a web page specified by the request. A transcoder receives the retrieved web page and applies a transcoding rule to extract data from the web page. The transcoding rule used is one of a set of predefined rules relating to the web page. The transcoder also transforms the data into a standardized form so that the adapter can then modifying the standardized data into a compatible form for display by the client device. Therefore, web based transactions can be performed by a variety of client devices, including portable, wireless and voice-based devices.

O'Brien teaches a smart browser working in conjunction with a HTTP server that selectively downloads WWW pages into the browser's memory cache. The determination of which pages to download is a function of a probability weight assigned to each link on a Web page. By evaluating that weight to a predetermined browser criteria, only those pages most probably to be downloaded are stored in the browser's memory cache. The download is done in the background while the browser user is viewing the current Web page on the monitor. This greatly enhances the speed with which the viewer can "cruise" the Web while at the same time conserving system resources by not requiring the system to download all the possible links.

However, the claimed invention, as provided in amended independent claims 1, 11, 12, 22, 23, and 33 contain features, which are patentably distinguishable from the prior art references of record. Specifically, claims 1 and 23 recite, in part, "...identifying, in response to said request, components of said application that may be requested by said user in the future, wherein the identifying process comprises graph analysis, statistical analysis, learning analysis, and response-

time analysis, wherein said learning analysis comprises associating a penalty with an incorrect prediction of said components of said application that may be requested by said user in the future and biases a probability of selection of successive components more towards recently occurring historical patterns than older historical patterns, and wherein in said response-time analysis a maximum number of components in the neighborhood of a current component that can be adapted within a desired response-time are adapted by: calculating the times required to adapt each respective component; and given a maximum response time and starting from said current component, adding said times in a breadth first search order until a sum of the added times reaches said maximum response time without exceeding said maximum response time;....”

Similarly, claim 12 recites, in part, “...identify, in response to said request, components of said application that may be requested by said user in the future, wherein the identifying comprises graph analysis, statistical analysis, learning analysis, and response-time analysis, wherein in said response-time analysis a maximum number of components in the neighborhood of a current component that can be adapted within a desired response-time are adapted by: calculating the times required to adapt each respective component; and given a maximum response time and starting from said current component, adding said times in a breadth first search order until a sum of the added times reaches said maximum response time without exceeding said maximum response time;....”

Additionally, claims 11 and 33 recite, in part, “...identifying, in response to said request, components reachable from said requested component, wherein the identifying process comprises graph analysis, statistical analysis, learning analysis, and response-time analysis, wherein said learning analysis associates a penalty with an incorrect prediction of said components reachable from said requested component and biases a probability of selection of

successive components more towards recently occurring historical patterns than older historical patterns, and wherein in said response-time analysis a maximum number of components in the neighborhood of a current component that can be adapted within a desired response-time are adapted by: calculating the times required to adapt each respective component; and given a maximum response time and starting from said current component, adding said times in a breadth first search order until a sum of the added times reaches said maximum response time without exceeding said maximum response time....”

Likewise, claim 22 recites, in part, “...identify, in response to said request, components reachable from said requested component, wherein the identifying comprises graph analysis, statistical analysis, learning analysis, and response-time analysis, wherein said learning analysis associates a penalty with an incorrect prediction of said components reachable from said requested component and biases a probability of selection of successive components more towards recently occurring historical patterns than older historical patterns, and wherein in said response-time analysis a maximum number of components in the neighborhood of a current component that can be adapted within a desired response-time are adapted by: calculating the times required to adapt each respective component; and given a maximum response time and starting from said current component, adding said times in a breadth first search order until a sum of the added times reaches said maximum response time without exceeding said maximum response time....”

The amended claim language incorporates the features previously provided in dependent claims 2, 13, 24, which are now cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Additionally, the Applicants have amended this particular language to clarify the claimed language in accordance with the suggestion in the Office Action. Therefore, the claims are in condition for allowance.

Moreover, the Applicants note that all claims are properly supported in the specification and accompanying drawings, and no new matter is being added. In view of the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections.

IV. Formal Matters and Conclusion

Applicants have amended claims 1, 11, 12, 22, 23, and 33 and cancelled claims 2-3, 13-14, and 24-25 from further consideration in this application without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants are not conceding in this application that those claims are not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner, as the present claim amendments and cancellations are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue these and other claims in one or more continuations and/or divisional patent applications.

With respect to the objections/rejections to the claims, the claims have been amended, above, to overcome these objections/rejections. In view of the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections to the claims.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that claims 1, 4-12, 15-23, and 26-33, all the claims presently pending in the application, are patentably distinct from the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to pass the above application to issue at the earliest possible time.

Should the Examiner find the application to be other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the local telephone number listed below to discuss any other changes deemed necessary. Please charge any deficiencies and credit any overpayments to Attorney's Deposit Account Number 09-0441.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 23, 2007

/Mohammad S. Rahman/

Mohammad S. Rahman

Registration No. 43,029

Gibb & Rahman, LLC
2568-A Riva Road, Suite 304
Annapolis, MD 21401
Voice: (301) 261-8625
Fax: (301) 261-8825
Customer Number: 29154